arXiv:1612.08532v1 [math-ph] 27 Dec 2016

OVERHANGING OF MEMBRANES AND FILAMENTS ADHERING TO PERIODIC GRAPH SUBSTRATES

TATSUYA MIURA

Abstract. This paper mathematically studies membranes and filaments adhering to periodic patterned substrates in a one-dimensional model. The problem is formulated by the minimizing problem of an elastic energy with a contact potential on graph substrates. Global minimizers (ground states) are mainly considered in view of their graph representation. Our main results exhibit sufficient conditions for the graph representation and examples of situations where any global minimizer must overhang.

1. Introduction

The figuration of elastic bodies is complicated to comprehend, especially taking external factors and constraints into consideration. When soft objects as membranes or filaments are sheeted on rough patterned solid substrates in small scale, it is observed that complex adhesion patterns can occur [6, 19, 28]. In this paper, it is considered that the objects are shaped by the competition between their elastic energy and adhesive interaction with substrates (cf. [23]).

This paper studies such adhesion problems mathematically in a one-dimensional setting. To be more precise, we consider the minimizing problem of the energy

$$\mathcal{E}[\gamma] = \int_\gamma ds \left[\frac{C}{2}\kappa^2(s) + \sigma\left(\gamma(s)\right)\right] \tag{1.1}$$

defined for planar curves γ. Here κ and s denote the curvature and arc length parameter respectively. Admissible curves γ corresponding to elastic bodies are constrained in the upper side of a given periodic substrate function ψ (as in Figure 1). The constant $C > 0$ corresponds to the bending rigidity. The contact potential σ takes values of σ_F when γ does not touch ψ and σ_B when γ touches ψ, where $0 < \sigma_B < \sigma_F$. (See Section 2 for details.)

Our energy is a simple generalization of the modified total squared curvature, so-called Euler's elastica energy (see [2, 3, 4, 14, 15] and also [16, 25, 27]), so that a contact potential corresponding to an adhesion effect is included. Its minimization invokes a free boundary problem with the elastica equation. The free boundary conditions are concerned with jumps of curvatures (see [23] and also [13, 22, 26]). Our model can be regarded as an elastic version of wetting problems (cf. [8, 17]).

The energy (1.1) is introduced in [23] expressly; the paper derives free boundary conditions and moreover investigates ground and metastable states for sinusoidal and fakir carpet substrates under the small slope approximation. In [18], the author derived a singular limit energy as $C \to 0$ for general smooth substrates in the graph

Key words and phrases. Adhesion; Elastica; Obstacle problem; Contact potential; Free boundary problem; Graph representation.

setting. In [12], a discretized energy is studied for graphs of uniformly bounded slope.

All the previous results assume the graph representation of admissible curves γ, i.e., the absence of overhangs. This yields strong topological and morphological constraints which make the problem easier to analyze, however its adequacy is nontrivial. In fact, the aforementioned paper [12] shows a numerical example with blowing-up slope, which indicates the existence of a non-graph minimizer (this example is pointed out by the author to exist). The present paper gives the first rigorous study on the adequacy; providing that substrates are graphs but admissible curves are not necessarily so, we consider whether global minimizers (ground states) are represented as graphs.

Global minimizers should be flat in many limiting cases; dominant bending effect ($C = \infty$), no adhesion ($\sigma_F = \sigma_B$) or flat substrate ($\psi = 0$). Hence, the graph representation is expected at least nearly the above cases. Indeed, Theorem 3.3 and 3.4 give some quantitative conditions that minimizers must be graphs. The conditions correspond to the above three cases. Our proof relies on only energy arguments; we compare all non-graph curves with special graph competitors.

On the other hand, even if ψ is smooth of class C^∞, it turns out that there are situations such that global minimizers are overhanging, i.e., not represented by graphs. More precisely, as a main result (Theorem 4.4), we rigorously prove that minimizers must overhang for any small C and σ_B and almost singular substrates ψ with $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1} \ll C$, which are smooth but shaped like fakir carpets. Our proof is based on a geometric viewpoint to classify possible global states of non-overhanging curves by using the shape of ψ, and an energy estimate for each of the cases. A special overhanging competitor is then constructed in view of optimal bending scale. Furthermore, we also prove that if such substrates are Lipschitz, i.e., folding singularly $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1} = 0$, then C can be small arbitrarily for a fixed substrate (Theorem 4.7). To this end, we need further discussion for local bending structure, however we still only use energy arguments.

In the rest of this section, reviewing related mathematical literature, we see that in our one-dimensional problem both the contact potential and the total squared curvature play crucial roles for overhangs.

There is much mathematical literature of first order energies with contact potentials on flat substrates (see e.g. [1, 5, 29, 30] for graphs, [5, 17] for the boundary of sets and references therein). The problems in the cited papers roughly correspond to our problem with $C = 0$ and $\psi \equiv 0$ (but in higher dimensions). In first order cases, solutions may have edge singularities at the free boundary and the contact angle θ satisfies Young's equation $\cos\theta = \sigma_B/\sigma_F$. In particular, solutions may not be graphs in some higher dimensional cases (cf. [29]). However, although our substrates are not flat, our problem is one-dimensional and periodic thus the graph setting would be still suitable providing $C = 0$.

To our knowledge, there is little mathematical literature of higher order problems with contact potentials except the aforementioned papers [12, 18].

The total squared curvature is higher order and causes the loss of graph representation. In fact, it is well-known that there are non-graph solutions to the elastica equation, which our minimizers obey in the free part (see e.g. the figures in [4, 16]). Thus, imposing suitable boundary conditions (or length constraints), it is not difficult to see that a global minimizer of the modified total squared curvature would



FIGURE 1. Periodic substrate function ψ and periodic admissible curves. Admissible curves may overhang or self-intersect.

overhang. Our problem is a free boundary problem, hence the graph representation problem is more involved.

We finally mention that, in dynamical problems of curves (without constraints), the graph representation of solutions has also been concerned. Although the L^2-gradient flow of the length energy (curve shortening flow) preserves the graph property [10], one of the modified total squared curvature (curve shortening-straightening flow [15, 20, 21, 24]) may lose in the middle even in the periodic setting [11]. However, in such a periodic case without external factors, the stationary global minimizers are only straight lines. Our problem takes an adhesion effect into account thus even global minimizers may not be graphs.

This paper is organized as follows. Basic notation and definitions are prepared in Section 2. Section 3 provides some sufficient conditions for the graph representation of global minimizers. In Section 4, we prove the existence of situations where global minimizers must overhang. In Section 5, we give further discussion on overhangs and also mention self-intersections and local minimizers. Section 6 summarizes our results.

2. Preliminaries: curves, energy and quantities

In this section we prepare notation of admissible curves and the total energy and then formulate our problem. For simplicity, throughout this paper, we impose normalizations with respect to the wavelength and tension. In the last subsection we mention the relation between our normalized problem and original physical quantities.

2.1. Definition of admissible curves.

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function with 1-periodicity, that is, $\psi(x) = \psi(x+1)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the strict epigraph of ψ:

$$\Omega := \left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y > \psi(x)\right\}.$$

Denote its closure by $\overline{\Omega} = \{y \geq \psi(x)\}$ and the boundary by $\partial\Omega = \{y = \psi(x)\}$. The set $\overline{\Omega}$ corresponds to the upper side of the substrate ψ.

Let I be the open interval $(0, 1)$. We denote by H^2_Ω the set of all curves $\gamma \in H^2(I; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that γ is regular and confined in $\overline{\Omega}$, that is, $|\dot\gamma(t)| > 0$ and $\gamma(t) \in \overline{\Omega}$ for any $t \in \bar I$. The H^2-Sobolev setting corresponds to the square integrability of curvature. Recall that any regular H^2 curve is a regular C^1 curve by Sobolev embedding and hence γ and $\dot\gamma$ are defined pointwise in $\bar I$ (including the endpoints).

Moreover we say that a curve $\gamma = (x, y) \in H^2_\Omega$ is admissible if it satisfies the following periodic boundary condition:

$$x(0) = 0,\ x(1) = 1,\ y(0) = y(1),\ \dot\gamma(0) = \dot\gamma(1).$$

We denote the set of admissible curves by $\mathcal{A} \subset H^2_\Omega$.

Remark that the set $\mathcal{A}$ consists of the restrictions to I of regular curves $\gamma = (x, y) \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}; \overline{\Omega})$ such that $x(0) = 0$ and $\gamma(t + 1) = \gamma(t) + (1, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

In this setting, admissible curves may have any self-intersections, thus it may not be compatible with membrane problems. However, we easily confirm that all the results in this paper are valid in a membrane setting (see Section 5 for details).

2.2. **Definition of the total energy.** For any admissible curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ we define the length of one period by

$$L_\gamma := \int_I |\dot\gamma(t)|dt \geq 1. \tag{2.1}$$

The lower bound follows by the periodicity, in particular, by $x(0) = 0$ and $x(1) = 1$.

Using the arc length parameterization $0 \leq s \leq L_\gamma$, we define the total energy of one period:

$$E[\gamma] := \int_0^{L_\gamma} \left[\varepsilon^2 |\gamma_{ss}(s)|^2 + \Theta(\gamma(s))\right] ds, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is given and Θ is defined as $\Theta \equiv 1$ in Ω and $\Theta \equiv \alpha$ on $\partial\Omega$ with given $0 < \alpha < 1$. Note that $|\gamma_{ss}|^2$ is equal to the squared curvature κ^2.

Then our problem is formulated as

$$\min_{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}} E[\gamma]. \tag{2.3}$$

Our purpose is to know the shape of global minimizers, i.e., curves $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying $E[\gamma] = \min_{\mathcal{A}} E$. Hereafter a global minimizer is often called a minimizer simply.

The problem (2.3) is determined by the quantities $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ and the substrate ψ. The quantity ε corresponds to the normalized length (or bending) scale of minimizing curves. The ratio α corresponds to adhesivity. The smaller α is, the easier curves become to adhere. From Section 3, changing the parameters ε, α and ψ, we consider whether minimizers are represented as graphs or not.

2.3. **Existence of minimizers.** We shall state the existence of solutions to the problem (2.3).

Theorem 2.1. *The problem (2.3) admits a minimizer.*

This is proved by a basic direct method in the calculus of variations. However, we need some careful arguments to prove it rigorously thus postpone the precise proof until Appendix A. In general, the uniqueness is not expected in this problem.

2.4. **Bounds for minimum.** We have simple bounds for the minimum of E:

$$\alpha \leq \min_{\mathcal{A}} E \leq 1. \tag{2.4}$$

The upper bound follows since the trivial straight line $\bar\gamma(t) = (t, c)$, where c is a constant larger than the maximum of ψ, belongs to $\mathcal{A}$ and satisfies $E[\bar\gamma] = 1$. The

lower bound follows since for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $L_\gamma \geq 1$ and also

$$E[\gamma] \geq \int_\gamma \alpha ds = \alpha L_\gamma. \tag{2.5}$$

2.5. **On normalization of the problem.** As mentioned, our problem is normalized with respect to the wavelength and tension. To clarify the normalizations, we consider the relation between our problem and the original one. In the original problem, we only assume that admissible curves and a substrate have a same periodicity $\lambda > 0$.

If the substrate ψ_λ and admissible curves γ_λ have a general period $\lambda > 0$ and tension in the energy is also a general positive number, then our original problem is the minimization of

$$\mathcal{E}[\gamma_\lambda] := \int_0^{L_{\gamma_\lambda}} \left[\frac{C}{2}|(\gamma_\lambda)_{ss}(s)|^2 + \sigma(\gamma_\lambda(s))\right] ds, \tag{2.6}$$

where $C > 0$ is the bending rigidity and σ is tension with an adhesion effect; it is defined as $\sigma \equiv \sigma_F$ in $\{y > \psi_\lambda(x)\}$ and $\sigma \equiv \sigma_B$ on $\{y = \psi_\lambda(x)\}$ with $0 < \sigma_B < \sigma_F$.

Normalizing ψ_λ and γ_λ by rescaling as $\psi(x) = \lambda^{-1}\psi_\lambda(\lambda x)$ and $\gamma(s) = \lambda^{-1}\gamma_\lambda(\lambda s)$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}[\gamma_\lambda] = \lambda \sigma_F E[\gamma],$$

where the dimensionless quantities $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ in E are defined as

$$\varepsilon := \frac{1}{\lambda}\sqrt{\frac{C}{2\sigma_F}}, \quad \alpha := \frac{\sigma_B}{\sigma_F}. \tag{2.7}$$

Since we only used a similarity transformation, the shape of curves and a substrate is maintained. Thus, the minimizing problem of (2.6) is equivalent to (2.3) up to rescaling.

3. Graph solutions

In this section we prove that, under suitable conditions for ε, α and ψ, the problem (2.3) admits only graph minimizers.

We shall give the definition of graph curves.

Definition 3.1 (Graph curves)**.** We say that $\gamma = (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$ is a graph curve if $x'(t) > 0$ for any $t \in \bar{I}$.

Remark 3.2. By the periodicity, the condition $x'(t) > 0$ is equivalent to $x'(t) \neq 0$. Any graph curve γ is represented by an H^2 function in the y-direction; more precisely, there exists a 1-periodic function $u \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ such that its graph curve $(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}$ is a reparameterization of γ.

3.1. **Statements and discussion.** We first observe the following limiting cases; $\varepsilon = \infty$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\psi \equiv 0$. We easily notice that in all the cases minimizers are only straight lines. Indeed, in the case $\varepsilon = \infty$ or $\alpha = 1$, our energy is regarded as the total squared curvature or the modified one; they admit only straight line minimizers under the periodicity. Moreover, in the case $\psi \equiv 0$, it is trivial that a unique minimizer is the completely adhering straight line.

By the above observation, when $\varepsilon \gg 1$, $\alpha \approx 1$ or $\psi \approx 0$, we expect that any minimizer is nearly flat and hence a graph curve. Actually, the following two statements hold.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that* $(\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha \geq 1$. *Then, independently of* ψ, *any minimizer of* (2.3) *is a graph curve.*

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that* ψ *is of class* C^2 *and* $\|\psi''\|_\infty^2 \leq \frac{8\pi^2}{8/\alpha+1/\varepsilon^2}$. *Then any minimizer of (2.3) is a graph curve.*

Remark 3.5. Theorem 3.3 immediately implies that, fixing ε and taking $\alpha \approx 1$, or fixing α and taking $\varepsilon \gg 1$, any minimizer is a graph curve.

Using the original physical quantities (2.7), the condition $(\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha \geq 1$ in Theorem 3.3 is read as

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\frac{C}{\lambda^2} \geq \sigma_F\left(\frac{\sigma_F}{\sigma_B}-1\right).$$

This is enough to indicate the following two qualitative features: if the effect of adhesion is weak ($\sigma_B/\sigma_F \to 0$), or the effect of bending is strong ($C/\lambda^2 \to \infty$), then any minimizer must be a graph curve.

Remark 3.6. Theorem 3.4 states that, for any ε and α which may be small, if the substrate ψ is sufficiently flat in a second order sense $\psi'' \approx 0$, then our problem still admits only graph curve minimizers.

Recall that the sup norm $\|\psi''\|_\infty = \max_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\psi''(x)|$ is also a dimensionless quantity since $\|\psi''\|_\infty = \lambda\|\psi_\lambda''\|_\infty$, where ψ_λ is the original substrate of period λ and $\|\psi_\lambda''\|_\infty$ roughly corresponds to the maximal curvature of ψ_λ. By (2.7), the condition in Theorem 3.4 can be also represented by the original quantities.

3.2. **Proof of graph representation.** In this section we prove Theorem 3.3 and 3.4. We first obtain a lower bound for the energy of non-graph curves. This is a key step to prove our theorems.

Proposition 3.7. *Any non-graph curve* $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ *satisfies*

$$E[\gamma] > \min\left\{1, (\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha\right\}.$$

Proof. By (2.5), any curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ with $L_\gamma > 1/\alpha$ satisfies $E[\gamma] \geq \alpha L_\gamma > 1$. Thus it suffices to prove that any non-graph curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ with $1 \leq L_\gamma \leq 1/\alpha$ satisfies $E[\gamma] > (\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$E[\gamma] \geq \varepsilon^2\int_\gamma \kappa^2 ds + \alpha L_\gamma \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{L_\gamma}\left(\int_\gamma |\kappa| ds\right)^2 + \alpha L_\gamma.$$

Moreover, since γ is non-graph and periodic, its total absolute curvature (i.e., the total variation of its tangential angle) is larger than π. Noting that $1 \leq L_\gamma \leq 1/\alpha$, we have

$$E[\gamma] > \frac{\varepsilon}{1/\alpha}\pi^2 + \alpha = (\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha.$$

The proof is complete. □

We are in position to prove Theorem 3.3 and 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Proposition 3.7 and the assumption $(\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha \geq 1$ imply that any non-graph curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $E[\gamma] > 1$. Noting the upper bound in (2.4), such a curve is not a minimizer. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. By Theorem 3.3, we may assume $(\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha < 1$. Thus, by Proposition 3.7, we only need to prove that any $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $E[\gamma] > (\pi^2\varepsilon^2+1)\alpha$ is not a minimizer.

We compare such γ with the completely adhering competitor $\tilde{\gamma} := (\cdot, \psi(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}$, which is a graph curve since ψ is of class C^2. Noting that $2\|\psi'\|_\infty \le \|\psi''\|_\infty$ by the 1-periodicity, the curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} E[\tilde{\gamma}] &= \varepsilon^2 \int_I \frac{|\psi''|^2}{(1+|\psi'|^2)^{5/2}} + \alpha \int_I \sqrt{1+|\psi'|^2} \\ &\le \varepsilon^2 \|\psi''\|_\infty^2 + \alpha \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\|\psi''\|_\infty}{2}\right)^2\right). \\ &= \left(\frac{8\varepsilon^2+\alpha}{8\alpha}\|\psi''\|_\infty^2 + 1\right)\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The assumption of $\|\psi''\|_\infty$ immediately implies that $\frac{8\varepsilon^2+\alpha}{8\alpha}\|\psi''\|_\infty^2 \le \pi^2\varepsilon^2$ and hence $E[\gamma] > E[\tilde{\gamma}]$. Therefore, the curve γ does not minimize E. □

Remark 3.8. In the proof of Proposition 3.7, using the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means, we also have another type of lower bound as

$$E[\gamma] > \frac{\varepsilon^2}{L_\gamma}\pi^2 + \alpha L_\gamma \ge 2\pi\varepsilon\sqrt{\alpha}.$$

Thus the condition in Theorem 3.3 can be replaced by $4\varepsilon^2\alpha \ge 1$. Although this condition is meaningful quantitatively, it is not sharp enough to obtain the qualitative observation that any minimizer is a graph curve for any fixed ε and $\alpha \approx 1$.

4. Overhanging solutions

In this section we show that there is a combination of ε, α and ψ such that any minimizer must overhang.

Definition 4.1 (Overhanging)**.** We say that a curve $\gamma = (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$ is overhanging if there exists $t \in \bar{I}$ such that $x'(t) < 0$.

Remark 4.2. By the periodicity of $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, there is $t \in \bar{I}$ such that $x'(t) > 0$ in general, thus any overhanging curve must have "turns" in the x-direction.

Heuristically, overhanging solutions should appear in order to circumvent sharp mountain folds of substrates as in Figure 2 since minimizing curves should bend as the scale ε in principle.

However, this is a kind of local necessary condition and in general the global shape formation of curves is very complicated. Hence, in order to find overhanging minimizers rigorously, we deal with a substrate having sharp mountain folds such that its global shape is simple enough to know that any minimizer adhere to the substrate near a fold as in Figure 2.

In the rest of this section, we first give a formal discussion for a singular substrate, and then rigorously prove the existence of overhanging minimizers for smooth or Lipschitz substrates.



FIGURE 2. Curves near mountain folds. Minimizing curves should bend as the scale ε hence overhang to circumvent more sharp folds (center). Curves would not overhang for folds with large bending scale (left) or small slope (right).



FIGURE 3. Fakir carpet of height h and the 1-periodicity.



FIGURE 4. Non overhanging curves not touching the base part.



FIGURE 5. Non overhanging curves touching the base part.

4.1. **For fakir carpets: strategy.** In this subsection we give an intuitive explanation by formally taking a singular substrate as in Figure 3; ψ is the fakir carpet of height h and period 1, which is the most simple substrate with a singularly sharp mountain fold (but no longer a continuous function). Our strategy is to obtain a lower bound for the energy of all non-overhanging curves and show that there is a special overhanging competitor so that its energy is lower than any non-overhanging curve.

We first obtain a lower bound for non-overhanging curves. In the present setting, it turns out that, for any ε and α, any non-overhanging curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$E[\gamma] \geq \min\{1, h\}. \tag{4.1}$$

In fact, any non-overhanging curve γ is either, not touching the base part of the fakir carpet as in Figure 4, or touching as in Figure 5. Note that in both cases γ touches at most one side of the needle as in the figures since γ is not overhanging. (Touching both sides, the curve must have a singularity.) In the former case (Figure 4), the curve γ has the free part of length at least 1, i.e., $E[\gamma] \geq 1$. In the latter case (Figure 5), the curve γ has the free part of length at least h, i.e., $E[\gamma] \geq h$. Consequently, any non-overhanging curve satisfies (4.1).

On the other hand, providing that ε is sufficiently small as $\varepsilon < \min\{1, h\}/5$, we can define an overhanging competitor $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{A}$ as in Figure 6, which is almost adhering to the fakir carpet and bending in the free (non-adhering) part as circular



FIGURE 6. Overhanging competitor above the fakir carpet. The curve consists of the adhering straight parts and the non-adhering circular arc parts of radius ε.

arcs of radius ε. Then $\hat{\gamma}$ satisfies

$$E[\hat{\gamma}] < (1+2h)\alpha + 20\pi\varepsilon. \tag{4.2}$$

In fact, the total length of the bounded (adhering) part $\hat{\gamma}_B$ is less than $1+2h$, that is, $E[\hat{\gamma}_B] < (1+2h)\alpha$, and in the free part $\hat{\gamma}_F$ the energy $E[\hat{\gamma}_F]$ is bounded as

$$\int_{\hat{\gamma}_F} \left[\varepsilon^2\kappa^2 + 1\right] ds < 10\pi\varepsilon \left[\varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + 1\right] = 20\pi\varepsilon,$$

where $10\pi = 5 \times 2\pi$ is a rough upper bound for the total angle of the circular arcs.

Combining (4.1) and (4.2), wee see that the conditions

$$\alpha < m_h := \frac{\min\{1,h\}}{1+2h}, \quad \varepsilon < \frac{(1+2h)(m_h-\alpha)}{20\pi}$$

imply $E[\gamma] > E[\hat{\gamma}]$, which means that the energy of any non-overhanging curve γ is strictly higher than the overhanging competitor $\hat{\gamma}$.

In conclusion, for any fakir carpet ψ, if α and ε are sufficiently small then any minimizer must overhang.

Finally, we remark that for any $h > 0$ the inequality

$$m_h = \frac{\min\{1,h\}}{1+2h} \le \frac{1}{3}$$

holds and the equality is attained if and only if $h = 1$. This means that, at least in our method, the case of height 1 allows the optimal (highest) upper bound for α or ε to observe overhangs. The dimensionless quantity m_h may be read as a deviation of the hall of fakir carpets. Indeed, when $m_h = 1$ the hall is the square and as $m_h \downarrow 0$ the halls become thin rectangles. Thus, in other words, the more a hall deviates from the square, the smaller ε and α are necessary to be for overhangs.

4.2. **For smooth substrates.** A similar consideration is valid for a smooth but faker carpet like substrate ψ as in Figure 8.



FIGURE 7. Curve $\gamma = (x, y)$ under the assumption of Lemma 4.3.

The main difference from the singular case is that, in the smooth case, curves can touch both the walls of substrates. Thus we need to state that if a non-overhanging curve touches both the wall parts of a "thin" needle then the total energy is sufficiently high.

To this end, we prepare a general lemma concerning a lower bound for the bending energy of non-overhanging curves as in Figure 7. The lower bound only depends on the width of curves in the x-direction and the tangential angles at the endpoints.

We define the following nonnegative even function:

$$f(\theta) := \left| \int_0^\theta \sqrt{\cos\varphi} d\varphi \right| = \int_0^{|\theta|} \sqrt{\cos\varphi} d\varphi.$$

Moreover, for a regular curve γ, we define the tangential angle $\theta(t) \in (-\pi, \pi]$ at $t \in \bar{I}$ so that $\dot{\gamma}(t) = |\dot{\gamma}(t)|(\cos\theta(t), \sin\theta(t))$. Then we have the following

Lemma 4.3. *Let $J = (a, b)$ be a bounded interval and $\gamma = (x, y) \in H^2(J; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a regular curve such that $x'(t) \geq 0$ for any $t \in J$ and $y'(t_0) = 0$ for some $t_0 \in J$. Then the following inequality holds:*

$$\int_\gamma \kappa^2 ds \geq \frac{[f(\theta(a)) + f(\theta(b))]^2}{x(b) - x(a)}.$$

Proof. We first assume that a curve $\gamma = (x, y)$ satisfies $x'(t) > 0$ for any $t \in \overline{J}$. Then the curve is represented by some function $u \in H^2(x(a), x(b))$ such that $u'(x(a)) = \tan\theta(a)$, $u'(x(b)) = \tan\theta(b)$, $u'(x(t_0)) = 0$ and

$$\int_\gamma \kappa^2 ds = \int_{x(a)}^{x(b)} \frac{|u''(z)|^2}{(1 + u'(z)^2)^{5/2}} dz.$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x(a)}^{x(b)} \frac{|u''(z)|^2}{(1 + u'(z)^2)^{5/2}} dz \\ \geq\ & \frac{1}{x(b) - x(a)} \left(\int_{x(a)}^{x(b)} \frac{|u''(z)|}{(1 + u'(z)^2)^{5/4}} dz \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x(a)}^{x(b)} \frac{|u''(z)|}{(1+u'(z)^2)^{5/4}}dz \\
\geq\ & \left|\int_{\tan\theta(a)}^{0} \frac{dw}{(1+w^2)^{5/4}}\right| + \left|\int_{0}^{\tan\theta(b)} \frac{dw}{(1+w^2)^{5/4}}\right| \\
=\ & f(\theta(a)) + f(\theta(b)),
\end{aligned}$$

thus we obtain the desired lower bound.

For general $\gamma = (x, y)$ with $x' \geq 0$, we obtain the same conclusion by considering modified curves as $\gamma_\delta(t) = (x(t) + \delta t, y(t))$ for small $\delta > 0$ and taking the limit $\delta \to 0$. Note that $x(b) > x(a)$ holds even in this case by the assumption of γ. □

We now state and prove the main theorem. Let $h > 0$ and $0 < 2\delta < \min\{1, h\}$. A 1-periodic function ϕ is called δ-smooth fakir carpet of height h if ϕ is as in Figure 8, namely, of class C^∞ and satisfies

(1) $\phi(x) = \phi(1-x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1/2]$
(2) $\phi \equiv 0$ in $[0, 1/2 - \delta]$ and $\phi(1/2) = h$,
(3) $\phi' \geq 0$ in $[0, 1/2]$,
(4) $\phi''(x) = 0$ while $\delta \leq \phi(x) \leq h - \delta$.

Moreover, its base and wall parts as in Figure 9; the base part is the part with $y = \phi(x) = 0$ and the left (resp. right) wall part is the part with $y = \phi(x)$, $\delta \leq y \leq h - \delta$ and $\phi'(x) > 0$ (resp. $\phi'(x) < 0$). All the parts are straight.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $h > 0$ and $m_h := \frac{\min\{1,h\}}{1+2h}$. Then for any $\alpha < m_h$ and $\varepsilon < \frac{(1+2h)(m_h-\alpha)}{20\pi}$ there exists $0 < \bar{\delta} < \varepsilon$ such that, for any δ-smooth fakir carpet substrate ψ_δ of height h with $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, any minimizer of (2.3) is overhanging.*

Proof. Fix any $\alpha < m_h$ and $\varepsilon < \frac{(1+2h)(m_h-\alpha)}{20\pi}$. For any small $0 < \delta \ll \varepsilon$, we take a substrate ψ_δ of δ-smooth fakir carpet of height h. Take the overhanging competitor $\hat{\gamma}_\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ as in Figure 10. Then, by the similar way to obtain (4.2), we see that

$$E[\hat{\gamma}_\delta] \leq (1+2h)\alpha + 20\pi\varepsilon.$$

By the assumptions of α and ε, we have

$$E[\hat{\gamma}_\delta] \leq \min\{1, h\} - c,$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant independent of δ. Therefore it suffices to prove that

$$\liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \inf_{\gamma} E[\gamma] \geq \min\{1, h\}, \tag{4.3}$$

where the infimum is taken over all non-overhanging curves in the upper side of ψ_δ. Indeed, if this is proved then there exists $0 < \bar{\delta} < \varepsilon$ such that for any $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$ any non-overhanging curve γ satisfies $E[\hat{\gamma}_\delta] < E[\gamma]$.

Notice that any (non-overhanging) curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ belongs to at least one of the following three cases:

(1) γ does not touch the base part (Figure 11),
(2) γ touches the base part but not the left nor right wall part (Figure 12),
(3) γ touches both the left and right wall parts.



FIGURE 8. A 1-period part of the smooth but fakir carpet like substrate. The function is bending only in the gray regions and otherwise straight.



FIGURE 9. Base part and left and right wall parts of δ-smooth fakir carpets



FIGURE 10. Overhanging competitor $\hat{\gamma}_\delta$ above the smooth substrate ψ_δ defined for any small $\delta \ll \varepsilon$. The curve $\hat{\gamma}_\delta$ is adhering to the substrate only in the base and wall parts and otherwise bending as circular arc of radius ε. For any small δ the curve $\hat{\gamma}_\delta$ is overhanging.

We prove (4.3) for all the cases; Case 1, 2 and 3.

Case 1. By the periodicity, as in Figure 11, any curve $\gamma = (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$ may be regarded as satisfying $x(0) = -1/2$ and $x(1) = 1/2$. Then the condition of Case



FIGURE 11. A curve not touching the base part in $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. To avoid the base part, any periodic curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ must cross the gray region without touching the graph of ψ_δ.



FIGURE 12. A curve touching the base part but avoiding the right wall part in $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. To touch the base part and avoid the right (or left) wall part, any periodic non-overhanging curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ must cross the gray region without touching the graph of ψ_δ at least one time.

1 implies that γ passes through the region $\{|x| < 1/2 - \delta\}$ freely. Hence we have $E[\gamma] \geq 1 - 2\delta$, which implies (4.3).

Case 2. Similarly, as in Figure 12, we may regard any curve $\gamma = (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$ as satisfying $x(0) = -1/2$ and $x(1) = 1/2$, hence $y(0) = y(1) \geq h$. Then the condition of Case 2 and the fact that γ is non-overhanging imply that γ passes through the region $\{\delta < y < h - \delta\}$ freely at least one time. Hence we have $E[\gamma] \geq h - 2\delta$, which implies (4.3).

Case 3. For any non-overhanging $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ touching both the wall parts (tangentially), there are $t_1, t_2 \in I$ such that the part of γ from t_1 to t_2 satisfies the assumption of Lemma 4.3 with $x(t_2) - x(t_1) \leq 2\delta$ and $|\theta(t_1)| = |\theta(t_2)| = \theta_\delta$, where $\theta_\delta > 0$ is the slope angle of the left wall part. Then Lemma 4.3 implies that

$$E[\gamma] \geq \varepsilon^2 \int_\gamma \kappa^2 ds \geq \varepsilon^2 \frac{4f(\theta_\delta)^2}{x(t_2) - x(t_1)} \geq \frac{2\varepsilon^2 f(\theta_\delta)^2}{\delta}$$

and especially (4.3). The proof is now complete. □

Theorem 4.4 indicates that the smallness of the height of ψ does not imply the graph representation of minimizers. In this view, we can simplify the statement as

Corollary 4.5. *For any $h > 0$, there exist ε, α and smooth ψ of height h such that any minimizer of (2.3) must overhang.*

In addition, as mentioned in the previous subsection, $h = 1$ gives the optimal upper bound $1/3$ for α in our method. In this view, Theorem 4.4 is simplified as

Corollary 4.6. *For any $0 < \alpha < 1/3$, there exist ε and smooth ψ such that any minimizer of (2.3) must overhang.*

4.3. **For Lipschitz substrates.** Finally, for small α, we give an example of a Lipschitz (singularly folding) substrate with large slope such that, any minimizer must be overhanging for "any" small ε. This kind of uniformity is mathematically important.

An intuitive explanation is as follows. In the smooth case, the bending scale ε needs to satisfy $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1} \ll \varepsilon$, where $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1}$ corresponds to the (minimal) bending scale of ψ. In the Lipschitz case, the bending scale of ψ is regarded as singularly small, say $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1} = 0$, thus for a fixed substrate ε can be small arbitrary.

We shall state it as a proposition. Let $h > 0$ and $0 < 2\delta < \min\{1, h\}$. A 1-periodic function ϕ is called δ-Lipschitz fakir carpet of height h if

$$\phi(x) := \max\left\{0, h - \left|\frac{h}{\delta}x - \frac{1}{2}\right|\right\}$$

for $x \in [0, 1]$. We also define the base and wall parts as well as the smooth case; namely, the base part is the part with $y = \phi(x) = 0$ and the left (resp. right) part is the part with $y = \phi(x)$, $\delta < y < h - \delta$ and $\phi(x)' > 0$ (resp. $\phi' < 0$).

Theorem 4.7. *Let $h > 0$ and $\alpha < \frac{\min\{1,h\}}{1+2h}$. Then there exist $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $\bar{\delta} > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$ and the δ-Lipschitz fakir carpet substrate ψ_δ of height h with any $0 < \delta < \bar{\delta}$, any minimizer of (2.3) is overhanging.*

Proof. Noting the condition of α, in the same way as Case 1 and 2 in Theorem 4.4, we see that there are $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, any non-overhanging curve is necessary to touch the left and right wall parts in order to minimize E. Note that for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ an overhanging competitor as in Figure 10 is well-defined since the substrate ψ_δ is folding singularly.

To complete the proof, we shall prove that, for any small δ, ε and any non-overhanging γ touching both the wall parts, there is an overhanging competitor $\hat{\gamma}$ such that $E[\gamma] > E[\hat{\gamma}]$.

Fix $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and take any non-overhanging $\gamma = (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$ touching both the wall parts. Then there are times $t_1 < t_2$ such that γ touches the left (resp. right) wall parts at t_1 (resp. t_2). Moreover, taking the supremum (resp. infimum) of time $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ so that $\gamma(t)$ touches ψ_δ and $x(t) < 1/2$ (resp. $x(t) > 1/2$), we see that there are times $t_3 < t_4$ in $[t_1, t_2]$ such that $\theta(t_3) = -\theta(t_4) = \theta_\delta$, where $\theta_\delta > 0$ denotes the slope angle of ψ_δ, and in (t_3, t_4) the curve γ does not touch ψ_δ except at the vertex $(1/2, \psi_\delta(1/2))$. Denote $r_0 = x(t_2) - x(t_1)$ and $r = x(t_4) - x(t_3)$ as in Figure 13.



FIGURE 13. Non overhanging curve γ touching the left and right wall parts. There are two touching points $\gamma(t_1)$ and $\gamma(t_2)$ of height less than $h - \delta$. There are also two points such that γ is tangent to the left and right slope there but does not touch ψ_δ between them.



FIGURE 14. The curve of Figure 13 modified from $\gamma(t_1)$ to $\gamma(t_2)$. The modified part consists of straightly adhering parts and a freely bending part with radius ε. This curve is well-defined and not self-intersecting whenever $\varepsilon \ll \delta$ and moreover overhanging whenever $\theta_\delta > \pi/3$.

Then, noting Lemma 4.3 and that γ circumvents the vertex of ψ_δ freely, the energy E of the part of γ from t_3 to t_4 is bounded below as

$$E[\gamma|_{[t_3,t_4]}] \geq \varepsilon^2 \frac{4f(\theta_\delta)^2}{r} + \frac{r}{\cos\theta_\delta}.$$

In addition, the part from t_1 to t_3 and from t_4 to t_2 are totally bounded below as

$$E[\gamma|_{[t_1,t_3]}] + E[\gamma|_{[t_4,t_2]}] \geq \alpha \cdot \frac{r_0 - r}{\cos\theta_\delta}$$

by considering the straightly adhering competitors. Therefore, the part of γ from t_1 to t_2 is bounded below as

$$\begin{aligned} E[\gamma|_{[t_1,t_2]}] &\geq \frac{\varepsilon^2 4f(\theta_\delta)^2}{r} + \frac{r}{\cos\theta_\delta} + \frac{\alpha(r_0-r)}{\cos\theta_\delta} \\ &= \varepsilon^2 4f(\theta_\delta)^2 \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1-\alpha}{\cos\theta_\delta} r + \frac{\alpha r_0}{\cos\theta_\delta} \\ &\geq \left(2\sqrt{4f(\theta_\delta)^2 \frac{1-\alpha}{\cos\theta_\delta}}\right)\varepsilon + \frac{\alpha r_0}{\cos\theta_\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

which does not depend on r.

On the other hand, providing that δ and ε are sufficiently small as $\theta_\delta > \pi/3$ and $\varepsilon < \delta/3$, the competitor $\hat{\gamma}$ constructed by modifying γ in (t_1, t_2) as in Figure 14 is well-defined and overhanging. The energy of $\hat{\gamma}$ from t_1 to t_2 is bounded above as

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{\gamma}|_{[t_1,t_2]}] &\leq 6\pi\varepsilon\left[\varepsilon^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}+1\right] + \alpha\cdot\frac{r_0}{\cos\theta_\delta} \\ &= 12\pi\varepsilon + \frac{\alpha r_0}{\cos\theta_\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

In the outside of (t_1, t_2), the curves $\hat{\gamma}$ and γ are equal.

Consequently, noting that for any small $\delta > 0$

$$2\sqrt{4f(\theta_\delta)^2\frac{1-\alpha}{\cos\theta_\delta}} > 12\pi,$$

we have $E[\gamma] > E[\hat{\gamma}]$ for any small δ and ε. The proof is now complete. □

5. Discussion

In this section, we give some further remarks and discussions.

5.1. **Small bending scale.** We first discuss the graph representation of minimizers for small bending scale ε. Recall that Theorem 3.3 states that large bending scale $\varepsilon \gg 1$ implies the graph representation independently of ψ.

The case $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is not easy to obtain the graph representation since bending does not cost much energy. Indeed, Theorem 4.4 and 4.7 state that overhanging minimizers exist when ε is small and the minimal bending scale $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1}$ of ψ is much smaller. However, we may expect the graph representation when ε is sufficiently smaller than $\|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1}$ by the following formal observation (cf. [18]). When ψ is smooth and $\varepsilon = 0$, minimizers shall be Lipschitz functions with straight free parts as in Figure 15. They have edge singularities at the contact points as valley folds and the minimal distance d among the singularities is bounded below (by a constant depending on α and ψ). Thus, for small $\varepsilon \ll \min\{d, \|\psi''\|_\infty^{-1}\}$, any minimizer would be obtained by modifying such valley folds smoothly as in Figure 15. Moreover, in contrast to mountain folds (Figure 2), the modification of valley folds would not require to increase the slope. Hence any minimizer is expected to be a graph curve.

5.2. **Flat substrates.** Theorem 3.4 states that a second order flatness of ψ implies the graph representation of minimizers; for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ there is $k > 0$ such that if ψ satisfies $\|\psi''\|_\infty \leq k$ then any minimizer is a graph curve. The problem would become more difficult if we replace ψ'' with ψ' or ψ.

Another interesting problem is the following uniform and strong version: is there $k > 0$ such that for any ε, α and ψ with $\|\psi''\|_\infty \leq k$ or $\|\psi'\|_\infty \leq k$ any minimizer



FIGURE 15. Minimizer on a smooth substrate for small ε. If $\varepsilon = 0$ then the minimizer has valley fold singularities as the left. When ε is small the singularities would be modified as smooth curves with scale ε as the right.

is a graph curve? Notice that Theorem 4.7 states that any smallness of $\|\psi\|_\infty$ does not imply the above conclusion.

5.3. **On self-intersections.** Self-intersections are more difficult to occur than overhangs in the sense that any self-intersecting curve in $\mathcal{A}$ must be overhanging. Here we say that $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ has a self-intersection if there are $0 \le t_1 < t_2 < 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\gamma(t_1) = \gamma(t_2) + (m, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. This definition is suitable for our periodic setting; if we take $\tilde{\gamma} \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}(t+1) = \tilde{\gamma}(t) + (1, 0)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\tilde{\gamma}$ is not injective if and only if the restriction $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma}|_I \in \mathcal{A}$ has a self-intersection in the above sense. This paper proves the existence of overhanging minimizers, but it is not clear whether there exist self-intersecting minimizers in our setting.

Our admissible curves $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ may have any self-intersection (self-contact and self-crossing) as mentioned, thus our problem would be a priori suitable only for filaments but not membranes. To make our problem compatible with membranes, we especially need to exclude self-crossing curves. To this end, let $\mathcal{A}_* \subset \mathcal{A}$ be the H^2-weak closure of the set of curves without self-intersection. This set is compatible with membranes since $\mathcal{A}_*$ consists of non self-intersecting curves and limits of such curves at least in C^1; especially, any curve of $\mathcal{A}_*$ is not self-crossing but only self-contacting. Then all the results in this paper are valid even if we replace $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{A}_*$ in the problem (2.3) since all the competitors used in our proof have no self-intersection. The existence of minimizers is proved in the same way as Appendix A since $\mathcal{A}_*$ is H^2-weakly closed.

We mention that this kind of self-contact setting has been considered in e.g. [7, 9]. In particular, the paper [7] proves for confined closed free elasticae that (i) any convex confinement admits only convex minimizers, which especially have no self-intersection, and (ii) there is a confinement with two halls which admits a self-contacting minimizer. These results indicate that whether minimizers have self-contacts crucially relates to the simplicity of confinements. Our graph confinements are simple, however the effect of adhesion make curves easier to form complicated shapes and hence the self-intersection problem becomes more nontrivial.

5.4. **Local minimizers.** We finally mention local minimizers. A curve $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ is called a local minimizer if there is $\delta > 0$ such that $E[\gamma] \ge E[\gamma_0]$ for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\|\gamma - \gamma_0\|_{H^2} \le \delta$.

A straight line sufficiently above ψ is obviously a graph local minimizer in any case. However, the straight line touching ψ is not necessarily a local minimizer. The existence of graph local minimizers touching ψ is not trivial.

Moreover, it is shown that there are infinitely many self-intersecting local minimizers in $\mathcal{A}$ by using a kind of winding number. For $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, the winding number $N_\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$ is defined so that $2\pi N_\gamma$ is equal to the total curvature, or equivalently

$$2\pi N_\gamma = \theta(1) - \theta(0),$$

where $\theta : \overline{I} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous representation of tangential angle (unique up to addition by a constant of $2\pi\mathbb{Z}$). The winding number is obviously continuous with respect to the C^1-topology, thus so with respect to the weak and strong H^2-topologies. Thus, denoting by $\mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathcal{A}$ the set of all curves with $N_\gamma = n$, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the set $\mathcal{A}_n$ is open and closed in $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to both the weak and strong H^2-topologies. Since $\mathcal{A}_n$ is weakly closed, in the same way as Appendix A, we can prove that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ there is a minimizer of E among $\mathcal{A}_n$. Then, since $\mathcal{A}_n$ is strongly open, it turns out that such a minimizing curve is nothing but a local minimizer in the whole space $\mathcal{A}$. Any curve with $N_\gamma \neq 0$ has a self-intersection, thus there are infinitely many self-intersecting (and overhanging) local minimizers in $\mathcal{A}$. In the membrane setting $\mathcal{A}_*$, the above argument does not work since the winding number of any curve is zero, thus the existence of overhanging local minimizers is nontrivial.

6. Conclusion

We considered the one-dimensional energy minimizing problem (2.3) concerning periodic filaments and membranes adhering to graph substrates with the same period. We obtained sufficient conditions so that any global minimizer is represented as a graph (Theorem 3.3 and 3.4). Moreover, by considering fakir carpet like substrates, we proved that there are situations so that any minimizer is overhanging, i.e., not represented as a graph (Theorem 4.4 and 4.7). All the results are valid both the problems of filaments and membranes.

This paper dealt with substrates only of special shape for overhangs, however it would make the mechanism of overhangs more understandable. One direction of future works is to understand the mechanism for more general substrates. We then need to consider more precisely both local and global structure of substrates; in particular, we should perceive general "depth of halls" or "sharpness of mountains".

In addition, we exhibited related open problems in the previous section. In particular, it would be important to understand the possibility of self-intersections and the shape of local minimizers. Concerning self-intersections, we may need to take interactions of filaments or membranes themselves into account for more physical situations.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Professor Olivier Pierre-Louis for his comments and discussion. This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows 15J05166 and the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan.

Appendix A. Proof of existence

We confirm the existence theorem (Theorem 2.1) by a direct method in the calculus of variations.

Proof. We first note that $\inf_{\mathcal{A}} E \leq \sigma_F$ by (2.4) and the case $\inf_{\mathcal{A}} E = \sigma_F$ is trivial since a trivial straight line competitor is nothing but a minimizer. Thus we may assume $\inf_{\mathcal{A}} E < \sigma_F$.

Take a minimizing sequence $\{\gamma_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\sigma_F > E[\gamma_n] \to \inf_{\mathcal{A}} E \ (\geq \sigma_B).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that all the curves are constant speed. In this case, the total energy of γ_n is represented as

$$E[\gamma] = \frac{C}{2L_\gamma^3} \int_I |\ddot{\gamma}(t)|^2 dt + L_\gamma \int_I \sigma(\gamma(t)) dt.$$

Now we obtain the boundedness of $\{\gamma_n\}_n$ in $H^2(I;\mathbb{R}^2)$. Since $L_{\gamma_n}\sigma_B \leq E[\gamma_n]$, the sequence $\{L_{\gamma_n}\}_n$ is bounded. Thus, noting that γ_n is constant speed, the sequence of $\|\dot{\gamma}_n\|_2 = L_{\gamma_n}$ is also bounded. Moreover, since $\frac{C}{2L_{\gamma_n}^3}\|\ddot{\gamma}_n\|_2^2 \leq E[\gamma_n]$, the sequence of $\|\ddot{\gamma}_n\|_2$ is also bounded. Finally, since $E[\gamma_n] < \sigma_F$, we see that all the curves γ_n must touch $\partial\Omega$. Combining this fact with the uniformly boundedness of length and the periodic boundary condition, we find that the sequence of $\|\gamma_n\|_\infty$ is bounded, thus the sequence of $\|\gamma_n\|_2$ is also bounded. Therefore, the sequence $\{\gamma_n\}_n$ is bounded in $H^2(I;\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Noting that $H^2(I;\mathbb{R}^2)$ is compactly embedded in $C^1(I;\mathbb{R}^2)$, there exists $\gamma \in H^2(I;\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, up to a subsequence (not relabeled), γ_n converges to γ in C^1 and weakly in H^2. Notice that $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, the curve γ is constant speed and $L_{\gamma_n} \to L_\gamma \geq 1$. It only remains to prove $\liminf_{n\to\infty} E[\gamma_n] \geq E[\gamma]$. The lower semicontinuity of σ and Fatou's lemma imply

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_I \sigma(\gamma_n(t)) dt \geq \int_I \sigma(\gamma(t)) dt.$$

Moreover, $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \|\ddot{\gamma}_n\|_2 \geq \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_2$ holds since $\ddot{\gamma}_n \to \ddot{\gamma}$ weakly in L^2. Combining the convergence of length, we obtain the lower semicontinuity of E. Consequently, the curve γ is a minimizer. □

References

[1] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary, J. Reine Angew. Math. 325 (1981), 105–144.

[2] G. Bellettini, L. Mugnai, Characterization and representation of the lower semicontinuous envelope of the elastica functional, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 21 (2004), no. 6, 839–880.

[3] K. Bredies, T. Pock, B. Wirth, A convex, lower semicontinuous approximation of Euler's elastica energy, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 47 (2015), no. 1, 566–613.

[4] G. Brunnett, A new characterization of plane elastica, In: Mathematical methods in computer aided geometric design II, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1992, pp. 43–56.

[5] L. A. Caffarelli, A. Friedman, Regularity of the boundary of a capillary drop on an inhomogeneous plane and related variational problems, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 1 (1985), no. 1, 61–84.

[6] V. Derycke, R. Martel, J. Appenzeller, P. Avouris, Carbon Nanotube Inter- and Intramolecular Logic Gates, Nano Lett. 1 (2001), 453–456.

[7] F. Dayrens, S. Masnou, M. Novaga, Existence, regularity and structure of confined elasticae, preprint (arXiv:1508.05785)
[8] P.-G. de Gennes, F. Brochard-Wyart, D. Quéré, Capillarity and Wetting Phenomena: Drops, Bubbles, Pearls, Waves, Springer, New York, 2004.
[9] P. W. Dondl, L. Mugnai, M. Röger, Confined elastic curves, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 71 (2011), no. 6, 2205–2226.
[10] K. Ecker, G. Huisken, Mean curvature evolution of entire graphs, Ann. of Math. (2) 130 (1989), no. 3, 453–471.
[11] C. M. Elliott, S. Maier-Paape, Losing a graph with surface diffusion, Hokkaido Math. J. 30 (2001), no. 2, 297–305.
[12] T. Kemmochi, Numerical analysis of elastica with obstacle and adhesion effects, preprint (arXiv:1604.03400)
[13] L. Landau, E. Lifshitz, Theory of Elasticity, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1986.
[14] A. Linnér, Explicit elastic curves, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 16 (1998), no. 5, 445–475.
[15] A. Linnér, Curve-straightening and the Palais-Smale condition, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 350 (1998), no. 9, 3743–3765.
[16] A. E. H. Love, A treatise on the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity, Fourth Ed. Dover Publications, New York, 1944.
[17] A. Mellet, Some mathematical aspects of capillary surfaces, In: Singularities in mechanics: formation, propagation and microscopic description, Panor. Synthèses, 38, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2012, pp. 91–124.
[18] T. Miura, Singular perturbation by bending for an adhesive obstacle problem, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, in press.
[19] J. Nicolle, D. Machon, P. Poncharal, O. Pierre-Louis, A. San-Miguel, Pressure-Mediated Doping in Graphene, Nano Lett. 11 (2011), 9, 3564–3568.
[20] M. Novaga, S. Okabe, Curve shortening-straightening flow for non-closed planar curves with infinite length, J. Differential Equations 256 (2014), no. 3, 1093–1132.
[21] S. Okabe, The existence and convergence of the shortening-straightening flow for non-closed planar curves with fixed boundary, In: International Symposium on Computational Science 2011, GAKUTO Internat. Ser. Math. Sci. Appl., 34, Gakkōtosho, Tokyo, 2011, pp. 1–23.
[22] X. Oyharcabal, T. Frisch, Peeling off an elastica from a smooth attractive substrate, Phys. Rev. E 71 (2005), 036611.
[23] O. Pierre-Louis, Adhesion of membranes and filaments on rippled surfaces, Phys. Rev. E 78 (2008), 021603.
[24] A. Polden, Curves and surfaces of least total curvature and fourth-order flows, Dissertation, University of Tuebingen, 1996.
[25] Y. L. Sachkov, Maxwell strata in the Euler elastic problem, J. Dyn. Control Syst. 14 (2008), no. 2, 169–234.
[26] U. Seifert, R. Lipowsky, Adhesion of vesicles, Phys. Rev. A 42 (1990), 4768.
[27] D. A. Singer, Lectures on elastic curves and rods, In: Curvature and variational modeling in physics and biophysics, 1002, Amer. Inst. Phys., Melville, NY, 2008, pp. 3–32.
[28] M. Yamamoto, O. Pierre-Louis, J. Huang, M. Fuhrer, T. Einstein, W. Cullen, "The Princess and the Pea" at the Nanoscale: Wrinkling and Delamination of Graphene on Nanoparticles, Phys. Rev. X 2 (2012), 041018.
[29] Y. Yamaura, The regularity of minimizers of a radially symmetric free boundary problem, Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez. VII 38 (1992), 177–192.
[30] Y. Yamaura, A free boundary problem for the minimal surface equation, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (7) 8 (1994), no. 1, 201–229.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo, 153-8914 Japan

E-mail address: miura@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp